

one to each patient on the occasion of his first visit, and it should save many cases for many treatments. In replying, address the Surgeon-General, U. S. Public Health Service.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. VONDERLEHR,
Assistant Surgeon General,
Division of Venereal Diseases.

Concerning new edition of "New and Nonofficial Remedies."

(COPY)

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL ON PHARMACY AND CHEMISTRY

Chicago, June 6, 1938.

To the Editor:—We are forwarding a copy of "New and Nonofficial Remedies," 1938, and a copy of the "Annual Reports of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry," 1937, with the compliments of the Council. We trust that these books will be of help to you in your editorial work.

A review of the new edition of "New and Nonofficial Remedies" and of the Council reports in your journal will be appreciated.*

Yours sincerely,

PAUL NICHOLAS LEECH,
Secretary, Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry.

Concerning proposed State Humane Pound Law.

OFFICE OF

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

(COPY)

San Francisco, June 16, 1938.

To the Editor:—For your information I am enclosing copies of correspondence which is self-explanatory. This is sent for your information.

Sincerely,

J. C. GEIGER, M.D., *Director.*

✓ ✓ ✓

OFFICE OF

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

(COPY)

June 15, 1938.

Mr. V. Collins, Secretary,
General Volunteer Campaign Committee,
For State Humane Pound Act,
406 Sutter Street, San Francisco.

My Dear Mr. Collins:

I am very much interested in your letter of June 11, addressed to the members of the Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, in convention now assembled in San Francisco.

Any letter or expression purporting that I am opposed to the use of impounded dogs is a curiosity, indeed, to me. I recall very distinctly several years ago of having made a recommendation at the time a new pound ordinance was under consideration before the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco to allocate a number of the animals collected by the pound to the universities for experimental purposes. This recommendation subjected me to extraordinary criticism and threats, and the resultant hearings before the Board of Supervisors were near-riots.

I have gone through our correspondence that occurred at that time with Mr. A. J. Gallagher, a Supervisor of the City and County of San Francisco, who handled the pound ordinance. I am attaching a copy of my letter of August 31, 1932, which was in answer to an attempt by someone to

include in this ordinance a section granting the power of inspection of various laboratories to certain individuals connected with the pound. I think this letter, especially the third paragraph on page two, will definitely indicate to you my feelings accordingly and why my original request for allocation of these animals to research institutions was withdrawn.

In conclusion, I hope in the future you will quote me or the circumstances correctly. Furthermore, I desire to point out that the so-called humane pound law, if passed, would be a detriment to the public health, to scientific medicine and to the control of disease, whether in humans or animals.

Sincerely,

J. C. GEIGER, M.D., *Director.*

✓ ✓ ✓

(COPY)

August 31, 1932.

Mr. Andrew J. Gallagher,
Supervisor, City Hall,
San Francisco, California.

My dear Mr. Gallagher:

With reference to our conversation at the Board of Supervisors as to Article 10 on the calendar of the Board for the meetings of August 29, when there was some discussion as to Section 27 of an ordinance providing a public pound, it is my distinct understanding that you requested an opinion from me as an individual as well as the Director of Public Health accordingly. A previously arranged trip with the Public Utilities Commission to Hetch Hetchy, however, will preclude my being present when called again. Likewise, because of the gratuitous insults directed toward me at a previous meeting on animal experimentation perhaps it is just as well that I cannot be present, therefore my opinion is given in writing.

There are two universities and one research institution that may be involved in animal experimentation for scientific purposes in San Francisco, namely, the Medical School of the University of California, Stanford University School of Medicine, and the Hooper Foundation for Medical Research of the University of California.

It is the writer's opinion that to pass Section 27 would grant or serve as an excuse, to many persons, either officially or otherwise, to act as inspectors and annoy legitimate research workers by requesting, and perhaps demanding, search for certain dogs or insisting that the dogs are in the institutions. Moreover, I consider this section entirely antimicrobial and, as an individual and as the Department of Public Health, we vehemently protest it. Furthermore, if anything antimicrobial inimical to animal experimentation upon which much of our modern public health depends comes from a committee officially dedicated to health it would appear to be a travesty on health.

May I point out to you that animal experimentation as a means of promoting human and animal welfare has recently received the sanction of two tribunals of great importance, one in the United States and the other in England. Both decisions tend to brighten the outlook for the protection of medical science against the perpetual warfare that threatens it through bequests for the support in perpetuity of organizations opposed to experiments on animals.

In the American case (Pennsylvania Company for Insurance on Lives and Granting of Annuities, executor of the estate of A. Sidney Logan, deceased, petitioner vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, respondent, 25 B. T. A.) the United States Board of Tax Appeals held that a bequest to a society organized for the "total abolition of all vivisection experiments on animals and other experiments of a painful nature" was not a bequest to a corporation organized and operated exclusively for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and that, therefore, the amount of such a bequest could not be deducted from the principal of an estate in computing the federal estate tax. The decision of the Court of Appeal in the English case (*In re Grove-Grady; In re Plowden vs. Lawrence*, 98 L. J., Chr. 261 (1920) 1 Ch. 557, the Law Journal, 71:329 (May 9), 1931, raised the question whether, "in the light of later knowledge in regard to the benefits accruing to mankind for vivisection," bequests designed to hinder and prevent vivi-

* Book reviews appear in this issue in front advertising section, as noted in front cover index, under Miscellaneous.